

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 stand rejected by the examiner. Claims 1 and 9 are independent claims. Assignee traverses the rejections as to the pending claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected in the office action under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Assignee has amended claim 9 herein based upon the remarks of the examiner to recite that a computer-readable storage medium stores the data structures recited in claim 9. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed subject matter rejections of claim 9 and its dependent claim 10 have been traversed and that these claims are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,941,550 issued to Sollich. Assignee respectfully disagrees that the cited art discloses the subject matter of the rejected claims.

Assignee respectfully provides herein an amendment to independent claims 1 and 9. The amended claims 1 and 9 are based on original claims 1 and 9 with limitations being added that relate to a compacting feature. The amendments are supported by assignee's specification, such as by the non-limiting example shown at step 800 of Figure 17 and which is further detailed with reference to Figures 28 to 30 on page 22, line 22, to page 25, line 21. For instance, the disclosure on page 23 and page 25, lines 3 and 4, describes sparse class interface dispatch tables. The compacting of sparse class interface tables by overlaying these so that non-null entries at ordinal

position fit into a compact dispatch table is described with reference to Figure 28, such as at steps 840 and 860 from page 23, line 17, to page 24, line 7.

The independent claims relate to the handling of runtime objects operating on a wireless device having only limited memory and processor resources (e.g., a wireless device). The claims provide for an efficient dispatch of an interface's method implemented by a runtime object and recite generation of a class interface check table (CIC) for each class, storing associations between interface ordinals and references to interfaces. Next, class interface dispatch table (CID) for each class storing associations between method ordinals and references to methods is generated. As the CID tables are potentially large and only sparsely populated, the CIDs of a plurality of classes are compacted into a compact dispatch table by overlaying the sparse class CIDs with a compacting approach, such as through the non-limiting example of an approach shown in Figure 28. The effect of the CID overlay in the example is shown in Figures 29 and 30. As a result, a single compact dispatch table is achieved, thus memory resources are saved.

Regarding the art rejection, there is no disclosure in the cited art regarding the limitations related to the compacting feature of the independent claims. For example, there is no disclosure in the cited art regarding claim 1's limitations of a direct dispatch wherein a compacted dispatch table is directly consulted using the method ordinal to perform the dispatch. In addition, none of the cited art discloses claim 1's limitations related to the compact CID tables of a plurality of classes in order to reduce memory requirements. Because of the lack of disclosure, the independent claims are allowable and should proceed to issuance.

Still further, claim 1 has been amended to recite that more than one interface may share the same interface ordinal in order to minimize the number of interface ordinals and that more than one method may share the same method ordinal in order to minimize the number of method

ordinals. Support for these amendments can be found in paragraphs [0060] and [0066] of the publication of this application. Because there is no disclosure in the cited art regarding these limitations, claim 1 is allowable for this additional reason.

Because the independent claims are allowable, their respective dependent claims are also allowable and should proceed to issuance. It is noted that assignee has not, at this time, presented arguments with respect to the dependent claims in the instant application. Assignee nevertheless reserves the right to argue the patentability of all of the dependent claims in the instant application at a future time, should that become necessary.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____


John V. Biernacki

Reg. No. 40,511

JONES DAY

North Point; 901 Lakeside Avenue

Cleveland, OH 44114

(216) 586-3939